

On certain equivalent norms on Tsirelson's space

Edward Odell *

Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann[†]

Abstract

Tsirelson's space T is known to be distortable but it is open as to whether or not T is arbitrarily distortable. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the norm $\|\cdot\|_n$ of the Tsirelson space $T(S_n, 2^{-n})$ is equivalent to the standard norm on T . We prove there exists $K < \infty$ so that for all n , $\|\cdot\|_n$ does not K distort any subspace Y of T .

0 Introduction

It remains open an important question as to whether or not there exists a distortable Banach space which is not arbitrarily distortable. The primary candidate for such a space is Tsirelson's space T . While it is not difficult to directly define, for every $1 < \lambda < 2$, an equivalent norm on T which is a λ -distortion, T does not belong to any general class of Banach spaces known to be arbitrarily distortable. In fact (see below) if there does exist a distortable not arbitrarily distortable Banach space X then X must contain a subspace which is very Tsirelson-like in appearance. It is thus of interest to examine in particular all known equivalent norms on T to see if they can arbitrarily distort T (or a subspace of T). We do so in this paper for a previously unstudied fascinating class of renormings.

The renormings we consider here are "natural" in that pertain to the deep combinatorial nature of the norm of T . Namely, for each n by $\|\cdot\|_n$ we denote the norm of the Tsirelson space $T(S_n, 2^{-n})$, which can be easily seen to be equivalent to the original norm on T . Our main result (Theorem 2.1) is that this family of equivalent norms does not arbitrarily distort T or even any subspace of T . The proof actually introduces a larger family of equivalent norms $(\|\cdot\|_j^n)_{j,n}$ and $(|\cdot|_j^n)_{j,n}$ which are shown to not arbitrarily distort any subspace of T . Quantitative estimates for the stabilizations of these norms are given in Theorem 2.5. It is shown that (up to absolute constants) one has that for all n and subspaces $X \subseteq T$ there is a subspace $Y \subseteq X$ such that $\|y\|_n \sim \frac{1}{n}$ if $y \in Y$ with $\|y\| = 1$.

Some stabilization results for more general norms on T of various classes are also given in Section 3. In Section 4 we raise some problems.

Section 1 contains the relevant terminology and background material. Otherwise our notation is standard as may be found in [LT].

More detailed information about Tsirelson's space and Tsirelson type spaces can be found in [CS], [OTW], [AD], [AO] and the references therein.

1 Preliminaries

$X, Y, Z, \dots$ will denote separable infinite dimensional real Banach spaces. If (x_i) is a basic sequence, $(y_i) \prec (x_i)$ shall mean that (y_i) is a block basis of (x_i) . $X = [(x_i)]$ is the closed linear span of (x_i) .

*Research supported by NSF and TARP.

[†]This author held the Canada Council Killam Research Fellowship in 1997/99.

If X has a basis (x_i) , $Y \prec X$ denotes $Y = [(y_i)]$ where $(y_i) \prec (x_i)$. The terminology is imprecise in that “ $\prec$ ” refers to a fixed basis for X but no confusion shall arise. $S_X = \{x \in X : \|x\| = 1\}$.

A space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ is *arbitrarily distortable*, if for all $\lambda > 1$ there exists an equivalent norm $|\cdot|$ on X satisfying for all $Y \subseteq X$

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{|y|}{|z|} : y, z \in S_Y \right\} > \lambda . \quad (1.1)$$

The norm $|\cdot|$ satisfying (1.1) is said to λ -distort X . X is λ -*distortable* if some norm λ -distorts X . X is *distortable* if it is λ -distortable for some $\lambda > 1$. If X has a basis then “for all $Y \subseteq X$ ” in the statement above can be replaced by “for all $Y \prec X$ ”.

Tsirelson’s space T (defined below) is known to be $2 - \varepsilon$ distortable for all $\varepsilon > 0$ (see e.g., [OTW]). If a space X exists which is distortable but not arbitrarily distortable then X can be assumed to have an unconditional basis [T], to be asymptotic c_0 or ℓ_p for some $1 \leq p < \infty$ [MT] and to contain ℓ_1^n ’s uniformly [M]. These characteristics in conjunction with others developed in [OTW] yield that T is the prime candidate for such a space.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the Schreier classe S_n is a pointwise compact hereditary collection of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ [AA]. We write for $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $E < F$ (resp., $E \leq F$) if $\max E < \min F$ (resp., $\max E \leq \min F$) or if either one is empty.

$$S_0 = \left\{ \{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \cup \{\emptyset\} .$$

We inductively define

$$S_{k+1} = \left\{ \bigcup_{p=1}^{\ell} E_p : \{\ell\} \leq E_1 < \dots < E_{\ell} \text{ and } E_p \in S_k \text{ for } 1 \leq p \leq \ell \right\} .$$

$(E_i)_{i=1}^{\ell}$ is k -admissible if $E_1 < \dots < E_{\ell}$ and $(\min E_i)_{i=1}^{\ell} \in S_k$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} S_k[S_n] &\equiv \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} E_i : (E_i)_1^{\ell} \text{ is } k\text{-admissible and } E_i \in S_n \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq \ell \right\} \\ &= S_{n+k} . \end{aligned}$$

If (y_i) is a basis then $(x_i)_1^{\ell} \prec (y_i)$ is k -admissible (w.r.t. (y_i)) if $(\text{supp } x_i)_{i=1}^{\ell}$ is k -admissible. Here if $x = \sum_{i \in A} a_i y_i$ and $a_i \neq 0$ for $i \in A$, then $\text{supp } x = A$.

c_{00} denotes the linear space of finitely supported real sequences and (e_i) is the unit vector basis for c_{00} . If $x = \sum_i x(i) e_i \in c_{00}$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ then $Ex \in c_{00}$ is defined by $Ex = \sum_{i \in E} x(i) e_i$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a pointwise compact *hereditary* (that is, $G \subseteq F \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow G \in \mathcal{F}$) family of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ containing S_0 and let $0 < \lambda < 1$. The Tsirelson space $T(\mathcal{F}, \lambda)$ is the completion of c_{00} under the implicit norm

$$\|x\| = \|x\|_{\infty} \vee \sup \left\{ \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \|E_i x\| : E_1 < \dots < E_{\ell} \text{ and } (\min E_i)_1^{\ell} \in \mathcal{F} \right\} \quad (1.2)$$

(e_i) is then a normalized unconditional basis for $T(\mathcal{F}, \lambda)$. Furthermore if $\mathcal{F} \supseteq S_1$ then $T(\mathcal{F}, \lambda)$ does not contain an isomorph of ℓ_1 but is *asymptotically* ℓ_1 (that is, if $(x_i)_1^{\ell}$ is 1-admissible then $\|\sum_1^{\ell} x_i\| \geq \lambda \sum_1^{\ell} \|x_i\|$). The existence of such a norm (1.2) can be found in [AD].

The classical Tsirelson’s space is $T \equiv T(S_1, 2^{-1})$ and we write $\|\cdot\|$ ($= \|\cdot\|_1$) for the norm of T . We also consider the space $T(S_n, 2^{-n})$, for a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and we denote its norm by $\|\cdot\|_n$. These norms are all equivalent on c_{00} and thus the spaces coincide. Indeed,

$$\|x\|_n \leq \|x\| \leq 2^{n-1} \|x\|_n \text{ for } x \in T . \quad (1.3)$$

We explain (1.3) and set some terminology for later use. $\|x\|$ is calculated as follows. If $\|x\| \neq \|x\|_\infty$ then $\|x\| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^\ell \|E_i^1 x\|$ for some 1-admissible collection $(E_i^1)_1^\ell$. For $i \leq \ell$ either $\|E_i^1 x\| = \|E_i^1 x\|_\infty$ or $\|E_i^1 x\|$ is calculated by means of a similar decomposition. Ultimately one obtains for some finite $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|x\| = \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |x(i)|,$$

where $n(i)$ is the number of decompositions necessary before obtaining a set $E_j^{n(i)}$ for which $\|E_j^{n(i)} x\| = \|E_j^{n(i)} x\|_\infty = |x(i)|$.

Thus the norm in T can be described as follows in terms of trees of sets. By an *admissible tree* $\mathcal{T}$ of sets we shall mean $\mathcal{T} = (E_i^n)$ for $1 \leq i \leq i(n)$, $0 \leq n \leq k$ is a tree of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ partially ordered by reverse inclusion with the following properties. E_i^n is said to have level n . $i(0) = 1$, $E_i^n < E_j^n$ if $i < j$, all successors of any E_i^n form a 1-admissible partition of E_i^n and every set E_i^{n+1} is a successor of some E_j^n . Thus all sets of level n form an n -admissible collection. E_i^n is a *terminal* set of $\mathcal{T}$ if it has no successors.

Thus one has for $x \in T$

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\| = \sup \Big\{ \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} \|E_i x\|_\infty : (E_i)_{i \in A} \text{ are terminal sets} \\ \text{of an admissible tree with level } E_i = n(i) \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

Also (1.4) holds if $\|E_i x\|_\infty$ is replaced by $\|E_i x\|$.

The norm $\|\cdot\|_n$ is calculated in a similar fashion except that terminal sets are allowed only to have levels kn for some $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_n = \sup \Big\{ \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-nk(i)} \|E_i x\|_\infty : (E_i)_{i \in A} \text{ are terminal sets of an admissible tree} \\ \text{where } E_i \text{ has level } nk(i) \text{ for some } k(i) = 0, 1, 2, \dots \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

From these formulas we see that $\|x\|_n \leq \|x\|$. Furthermore if $\mathcal{T}$ is an admissible tree, terminal sets not having levels $0, n, 2n, \dots$ can be continued to the next such level, an increase of at most $n - 1$ levels, yielding $\|x\| \leq 2^{n-1} \|x\|_n$.

More exotic *mixed Tsirelson spaces* were introduced in [AD]. We shall not discuss a general definition, but we shall give a formula for the norm in a special case of interest here. For $j \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we let $\|\cdot\|_j^n$ be the norm of the mixed Tsirelson space $T\left((S_{j+kn}, 2^{-(j+kn)})_{k=0}^\infty\right)$. One obtains a similar formula to that in (1.4) for the norm except that terminal sets may only have levels $j, j+n, j+2n, \dots$

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_j^n = \|x\|_\infty \vee \sup \Big\{ \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-(j+nk(i))} \|E_i x\|_\infty : (E_i)_{i \in A} \text{ are terminal sets} \\ \text{of an admissible tree having level } E_i = j + nk(i) \text{ for some } k(i) = 0, 1, 2, \dots \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

Thus $\|\cdot\|_0^n = \|\cdot\|_n$. Furthermore $\|\cdot\|_j^n$ is an equivalent norm on T .

We prove in Section 2 that the family of norms $(\|\cdot\|_j^n)_{n,j}$ cannot arbitrarily distort any subspace of T . We do this by introducing a slight variation of $\|\cdot\|_j^n$ (which omits the first term in (1.6)):

$$|x|_j^n = \sup \Big\{ \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-(j+nk(i))} \|E_i x\|_\infty : (E_i)_{i \in A} \text{ are terminal sets} \Big\} \quad (1.7)$$

of an admissible tree having level $E_i = j + nk(i)$, $k(i) \geq 0$ } .

Thus $|\cdot|_0^n = \|\cdot\|_n$, $|\cdot|_j^n$ is an equivalent norm on T and $|\cdot|_j^n \leq \|\cdot\|_j^n$. Our next proposition yields some simple facts about $|\cdot|_j^n$. Statements a) and b) are the reason we work with $|\cdot|_j^n$ rather than directly with $\|\cdot\|_j^n$. Moreover d) yields that $\|\cdot\|_j^n$ and $|\cdot|_j^n$ are nearly the same on some subspace of any given $Y \prec T$. First recall the Schreier space X_m ([AA], also [CS], for $m = 1$). X_m is the completion of c_{00} under

$$|x|_m = \sup \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in E} x(i) \right| : E \in S_m \right\} .$$

X_m is isometric to a subspace of $C(\omega^{\omega^m})$ and hence is c_0 -saturated: if $Y \subseteq X$ then Y contains an isomorph of c_0 . For $Z \subseteq T$, S_Z is the unit sphere w.r.t. the Tsirelson norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Proposition 1.1 a) Let $j \geq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $x \in T$

$$|x|_j^n = \frac{1}{2^j} \sup \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^r \|E_\ell x\|_n : (E_\ell)_1^r \text{ is } j\text{-admissible} \right\}$$

b) Let $j \geq 0$ and $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $x \in T$

$$|x|_{j+k}^n = \frac{1}{2^k} \sup \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^r |E_\ell x|_j^n : (E_\ell)_1^r \text{ is } k\text{-admissible} \right\}$$

c) Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq j < n$. Let $Y \prec T$. Then there exists $Z \prec Y$ so that if $z \in S_Z$

$$\left| |z|_j^n - |z|_{j+np}^n \right| < \varepsilon \text{ if } 1 \leq p \leq k . \quad (1.8)$$

d) For $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $Y \prec T$ there exists $Z \prec Y$ so that for all $z \in S_Z$,

$$\left| |z|_j^n - \|z\|_j^n \right| < \varepsilon \text{ and } \left| |z|_n^n - \|z\|_n^n \right| < \varepsilon .$$

Proof. a) and b) follow easily from (1.5)–(1.7) and the fact that $S_{k+j} = S_k[S_j]$. c) is proved by choosing Z so that the first few levels of the admissible tree used to compute $|z|_{j+nk}^n$ will contribute only a negligible amount. Precisely we first note that

$$|z|_j^n \geq |z|_{j+np}^n \geq |z|_{j+nk}^n \text{ for } 1 \leq p \leq k .$$

Thus we need only achieve (1.8) for $p = k$. Let $|\cdot|_{j+nk}$ be the norm of the Schreier space X_{j+nk} . For $z \in T$ let

$$|z|_j^n = \sum_{\ell \in A} 2^{-(j+nk(\ell))} |z(\ell)|$$

be obtained from (1.7). Thus if

$$E = \{\ell \in A : k(\ell) < k\}$$

then $E \in S_{j+nk}$ and so

$$|z|_j^n \leq |Ez|_{j+nk} + |z|_{j+k}^n \leq |z|_{j+nk} + |z|_{j+k}^n .$$

Also $|z|_{j+nk} \leq 2^{j+nk} \|z\|$ for $z \in T$. Since X_{j+nk} is c_0 -saturated and T does not contain c_0 it follows that given $Y \prec T$ there exists $Z \prec Y$ so that if $z \in S_Z$ then $|z|_{j+nk} < \varepsilon$. This proves c). d) is

proved similarly to c). The norms in question differ only in that the terminal sets of an admissible tree can differ only in a finite number of levels. $\square$

We shall need a generalized notion of n admissible. For $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(E_r)_1^s$ is n admissible (k) if $(kE_r)_1^s$ is n admissible where $kE \equiv \{ke : e \in E\}$. Similarly we say $(y_i)_1^\ell \prec (e_i)$ is n admissible (k) if $(\text{supp } y_i)_1^\ell$ is n admissible (k). Also we say a tree T is admissible (k) if $(kE)_{E \in T}$ is an admissible tree.

Proposition 1.2 *There exists $K_1 < \infty$ so that if $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $1 > \varepsilon > 0$ and $(y_i) \prec (e_i)$ is normalized (in T), then there exists a finite set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and $(\alpha_\ell)_{\ell \in A} \subset (0, 1]$ so that $(y_\ell)_{\ell \in A}$ is n admissible and setting $z = \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell y_\ell$ we have the following:*

- i) $\sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell = 2^n$.
- ii) If $B \subseteq A$ and $(y_\ell)_{\ell \in B}$ is $n-1$ admissible (k) then $\sum_{i \in B} \alpha_i < \varepsilon$.
- iii) $1 \leq \|z\| \leq K_1$

We call such a z an (n, ε) average (k) of (y_ℓ) . This was proved in [OTW] for $k = 1$. The proof uses the following fact (see e.e., [CS], Prop. II.4).

Proposition 1.3 *There exists $K_2 < \infty$ so that if (y_i) is a normalized block basis of (e_i) in T then for all (a_i) if $m_i = \min \text{supp } y_i$,*

$$\left\| \sum a_i e_{m_i} \right\| \leq \left\| \sum a_i y_i \right\| \leq K_2 \left\| \sum a_i e_{m_i} \right\|.$$

Proof of Proposition 1.2. By passing to a subsequence of (y_i) we may assume that $m_{i+1} > km_i$ where $m_i = \min \text{supp } y_i$. By [OTW] we can find $z = \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell y_\ell$, $(\alpha_\ell)_{\ell \in A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$, $\sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell = 2^n$ and $\sum_{\ell \in B} \alpha_\ell < \varepsilon/2$ if $(m_\ell)_{\ell \in B} \in S_{n-1}$. Furthermore $1 \leq \|z\| \leq K_1$. It remains to check that ii) holds. Suppose that $B \subseteq A$ so that $(km_i)_{i \in B} \in S_{n-1}$. Since $m_{i+1} > km_i$ this yields that $(m_{i+1})_{i \in B} \in S_{n-1}$ and hence $(m_i)_{i \in B \setminus \min B} \in S_{n-1}$. Thus $\sum_{\ell \in B \setminus \min B} \alpha_\ell < \varepsilon/2$. Also $\alpha_{\min B} < \varepsilon/2$ and so ii) holds. $\square$

2 Stabilizing the norms $(\|\cdot\|_n)$

Our goal is to prove that the norms $(\|\cdot\|_j^n)$ and hence in particular the norms $(\|\cdot\|_n)$ do not arbitrarily distort any subspace of T . In light of Proposition 1.1 it suffices to prove

Theorem 2.1 *There exists $K > 1$ so that for all $Y \prec T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $Z \prec Y$ and $d > 0$ satisfying: for all $0 \leq j < n$ and $z \in S_Z$*

$$d \leq |z|_j^n \leq Kd$$

Before beginning the proof we recall that there exists $K_3 < \infty$ so that $\|\sum b_i e_{3i}\| \leq K_3 \|\sum b_i e_i\|$ [CS], Prop. I.12.

Lemma 2.2 *Let (w_i) be a normalized block basis of (e_i) in T . Suppose that for some $c > 0$ and $L \geq 1$, we have for all i*

$$L^{-1}c \leq |w_i|_j^n \leq Lc \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq n.$$

Let $w = \sum a_i w_i$, $\|w\| = 1$. Then for $0 \leq j < n$, $c(LK_2)^{-1} \leq |w|_j^n \leq 2LK_3c$.

Proof. From Proposition 1.3 there exists an admissible tree $\mathcal{T}$ whose terminal sets are all equal to $\text{supp } w_i$ for some i yielding

$$\|w\| \geq \sum_{i \in A} |a_i| 2^{-n(i)} \|w_i\| = \sum_{i \in A} |a_i| 2^{-n(i)} \geq K_2^{-1}.$$

Let $1 \leq j \leq n$ be fixed. We shall produce a lower estimate for $|w|_j^n$ by extending $\mathcal{T}$ as follows. Fix $i \in A$ and consider the term $|a_i| 2^{-n(i)} \|w_i\|$. Suppose this term resulted from $E = \text{supp } w_i$ where E was terminal in $\mathcal{T}$ of level $n(i)$. First suppose that $n(i) \geq j$ so that $n(i) = j + kn + p$ for some $0 \leq p < n$ and $k \geq 0$; then let $q = n - p$. If $n(i) < j$ let $q = j - n(i)$. If $q \geq 1$ extend $\mathcal{T}$ q -levels below E via the q -admissible family of sets which yield by Proposition 1.1

$$|w_i|_q^n = \frac{1}{2^q} \sum_{s=1}^r \|E_s^i w_i\|_n \geq cL^{-1}.$$

The new tree has terminal sets only at levels $(j + kn)_{k=0}^\infty$. When used in (1.7) it yields

$$|w|_j^n \geq \sum |a_i| 2^{-n(i)} cL^{-1} \geq c(LK_2)^{-1}.$$

For the upper estimate let $\mathcal{T}$ be the admissible tree having terminal sets (which we may assume to be singletons) of levels $j, j + n, j + 2n, \dots$ which produces $|w|_j^n$ in (1.7). We say w_i is *badly split* by some level of $\mathcal{T}$ if there exist $E \neq F$ in $\mathcal{T}$ having the same level with $Ew_i \neq 0$, $Ew_s \neq 0$ for some $s \neq i$ and $Fw_i \neq 0$. If no w_i is badly split by some level of $\mathcal{T}$ then if for some i , $\text{supp } w_i$ contains a terminal set in $\mathcal{T}$ there exists a 1-admissible family $(E_s^i)_1^{\ell(i)}$ in $\mathcal{T}$ of minimal level having the property that $\bigcup_1^{\ell(i)} E_s^i \subseteq \text{supp } w_i$ and $F \cap \text{supp } w_i = \emptyset$ for all other $F \in \mathcal{T}$ of the same level as the E_s^i 's. Thus for some set A ,

$$|w|_j^n = \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \sum_{s=1}^{\ell(i)} |E_s^i w_i|_{j(i)}^n \quad (2.1)$$

where E_s^i has level $n(i)$ and $j(i) < n$ satisfies $n(i) + j(i) \in \{j, j + n, j + 2n, \dots\}$. Since $\|w\| = \|w_i\| = 1$, $\sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \leq 1$. Also

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{\ell(i)} |E_s^i w_i|_{j(i)}^n \leq |w_i|_{j(i)+1}^n \leq Lc$$

by our hypothesis. Hence

$$|w|_j^n \leq 2Lc.$$

Of course $\mathcal{T}$ may badly split some w_i 's. In this case we alter $\mathcal{T}$ as follows. Starting with the smallest level we check to see if a given level badly splits any w_i 's. If it does we split the offending sets at $\min \text{supp } w_i$ and $\max \text{supp } w_i$. Thus a given $E \in \mathcal{T}$ could be split into at most 3 pieces at this stage. We intersect successors of split sets with each of the at most three new pieces maintaining a tree, but losing admissibility. Then proceed to the next level of the new tree and repeat. We now have a tree $\mathcal{T}'$ that does not badly split any w_i . If we replace each set E in this tree by $3E$ we obtain an admissible tree. Thus $\mathcal{T}'$ is admissible (3). Furthermore, we obtain an expression like (2.1), except that the equality is replaced by the inequality:

$$|w|_j^n \leq \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \sum_{s=1}^{\ell(i)} |E_s^i w_i|_{j(i)}^n,$$

where the sets (E_s^i) come from our altered tree just like (2.1) was obtained from $\mathcal{T}$.

Letting $m_i = \min \text{supp } w_i$ we have $\|\sum a_i e_{3m_i}\| \leq K_3 \|\sum a_i e_{m_i}\| \leq K_3 \|w\| = K_3$. Since $\mathcal{T}'$ is an admissible (3) tree we have

$$\sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \leq K_3 .$$

Thus $|w|_j^n \leq 2K_3 Lc$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ to be specified later. By Proposition 1.1 we may assume

$$\left| |y|_j^n - |y|_{j+n}^n \right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq n \quad \text{and } y \in S_Y . \quad (2.2)$$

Also we may assume $(y_\ell) \prec (e_\ell)$ is a normalized (in T) basis for Y and that for some $(c_j)_0^{2n} \subseteq (0, 1]$,

$$\left| |y_\ell|_j^n - c_j \right| < \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } \ell , \quad 0 \leq j \leq 2n . \quad (2.3)$$

Hence we also have, from (2.2) and (2.3),

$$|c_j - c_{j+n}| < 3\varepsilon \quad \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq n . \quad (2.4)$$

Lemma 2.3 *Let $0 < i \leq n$ and let $z = \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell y_\ell$ be an (i, ε) average (3) of (y_ℓ) , $\alpha_\ell > 0$ for $\ell \in A$. Thus $(y_\ell)_{\ell \in A}$ is i admissible and $\sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell = 2^i$. Then*

$$c_{j-i} - \varepsilon \leq |z|_j^n \leq 2c_{j-i+1} + (K_3 + 1)2\varepsilon , \quad 0 < i \leq j \leq n \quad (2.5)$$

$$c_{n+j-i} - \varepsilon \leq |z|_j^n \leq 2c_{n+j-i+1} + (K_3 + 1)3\varepsilon , \quad 0 \leq j < i \leq n \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. (2.5): Let $k = j - i$. From Proposition 1.1, (2.3) and the fact that $S_k[S_i] = S_j$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_j^n &\geq \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell \sup \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^r \|E_s y_\ell\|_n : (E_s)_1^r \text{ is } k \text{ admissible} \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell |y_\ell|_k^n \geq \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell (c_k - \varepsilon) = c_{j-i} - \varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality in (2.5) is more difficult. By Proposition 1.1 there exist j admissible sets $(E_s)_1^r$ with

$$|z|_j^n = \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s=1}^r \|E_s z\|_n . \quad (2.7)$$

The sets $(E_s)_1^r$ are the terminal sets of an admissible tree $\mathcal{T}$, all having level j , and we may assume each $E_s \subseteq \bigcup_{\ell \in A} \text{supp } y_\ell$. We adjust the tree $\mathcal{T}$ by splitting some sets if necessary, as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.2, to obtain a tree $\mathcal{T}'$ which is admissible (3) and which does not badly split any y_ℓ , $\ell \in A$. It may be that for some $E \in \mathcal{T}'$ we have $E \subseteq \text{supp } y_\ell$ for some ℓ and level $E < i$. We remove all such sets from the tree $\mathcal{T}'$ (replace each F by $F \setminus \bigcup$ such sets and throw out the empty sets thus obtained). This gives us a tree $\mathcal{T}''$ which does not badly split any y_ℓ and for which no set of level $< i$ is contained in $\text{supp } y_\ell$ for any $\ell \in A$. $\mathcal{T}''$ is admissible (3).

Letting $(E'_s)_{s=1}^{r'}$ and $(E''_s)_{s=1}^{r''}$ be the terminal sets of $\mathcal{T}'$ and $\mathcal{T}''$, respectively, (2.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_j^n &\leq \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s=1}^{r'} \|E'_s z\|_n \\ &= \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s=1}^{r''} \|E''_s z\|_n + \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s \in D} \|E'_s z\|_n \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where $D = \{1 \leq s \leq r' : E'_s \text{ was discarded from } \mathcal{T}' \text{ in forming } \mathcal{T}''\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} B &\equiv \{\ell \in A : E'_s \subseteq \text{supp } y_\ell \text{ for some } s \in D\} \\ &= \{\ell \in A : E \subseteq \text{supp } y_\ell \text{ for some } E \in \mathcal{T}' \text{ with level } E \leq i-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $B' \equiv B \setminus \min B$ satisfies $(y_\ell)_{\ell \in B'}$ is $i-1$ admissible (3). Hence $\sum_{\ell \in B} \alpha_\ell \leq \alpha_{\min B} + \sum_{\ell \in B'} \alpha_\ell < \varepsilon + \varepsilon = 2\varepsilon$. Now $(E'_s)_{s \in D}$ is j admissible (3) and so for $\ell \in B$,

$$\frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s \in D} \|E'_s y_\ell\|_n \leq \|\tilde{y}_\ell\| \leq K_3$$

where $\tilde{y} = \sum a_i e_{3i}$ if $y = \sum a_i e_i$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s \in D} \|E'_s z\|_n \leq K_3 \sum_{\ell \in B} \alpha_\ell < 2K_3 \varepsilon.$$

From this and (2.8) we obtain

$$|z|_j^n \leq \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{s=1}^{r''} \|E''_s z\|_n + 2K_3 \varepsilon. \quad (2.9)$$

Recall that $k = j - i$. For $\ell \in A$, $\{E''_s : E''_s \subseteq \text{supp } y_\ell\}$ is $k+1$ admissible. Indeed y_ℓ could first be split into a 1-admissible family only at level i or later by $\mathcal{T}''$. The tree $\mathcal{T}''$ continues from this point in an admissible fashion up to level j . Thus from (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_j^n &\leq \frac{1}{2^j} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell \sup \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^p \|F_s y_\ell\|_n : (F_s)_1^p \text{ is } k+1 \text{ admissible} \right\} + 2K_3 \varepsilon \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell 2 |y_\ell|_{k+1}^n + 2K_3 \varepsilon \\ &\leq 2c_{k+1} + 2K_3 \varepsilon + 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (2.5).

For the lower estimate in (2.6) note that

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_j^n &\geq |z|_{j+n}^n \geq \frac{1}{2^{j+n}} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell \sup \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^r \|E_s y_\ell\|_n : (E_s)_1^r \text{ is } n+j-i \text{ admissible} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell (c_{n+j-i} - \varepsilon) = c_{n+j-i} - \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Furthermore the argument in proving the upper estimate of (2.5) yields that $|z|_{j+n}^n \leq 2c_{n+j-i+1} + (K_3 + 1)2\varepsilon$ and since $|z|_j^n \leq |z|_{j+n}^n + \varepsilon$ we obtain (2.6). $\square$

We continue the proof of Theorem 2.1 by using Proposition 1.2 to construct a block basis $(z_i)_{i=1}^n$ of (y_ℓ) so that each z_i is an (i, ε) average (3) of $(y_\ell)_{\ell=n}^\infty$. Let $z = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n z_i$. Let $c = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n c_i$.

Lemma 2.4 For $0 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\frac{1}{2}c - \frac{n+3}{2n}\varepsilon \leq |z|_j^n \leq 2c + 3\varepsilon(K_3 + 1)$$

Proof. If $1 \leq j < n$ then by Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_j^n &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|_j^n \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left[2(c_j + c_{j-1} + \cdots + c_1 + c_n + c_{n-1} + \cdots + c_{j+1}) + (K_3 + 1)3n\varepsilon \right] \\ &\leq 2c + 3\varepsilon(K_3 + 1) . \end{aligned}$$

Similarly if $j = 0$ or n

$$|z|_j^n \leq \frac{1}{n} \left[2(c_n + c_{n-1} + \cdots + c_1) + (K_3 + 1)3n\varepsilon \right] .$$

Hence the upper estimate is established.

To obtain the lower estimate we note that $(z_i)_1^n$ is 1 admissible hence by Proposition 1.1(b) if $1 \leq j \leq n$

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_j^n &= \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \right|_j^n \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |z_i|_{j-1}^n \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2n} [c_0 + \cdots + c_{n-1} - n\varepsilon] . \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_n > c_0 - 3\varepsilon$,

$$|z|_j^n \geq \frac{1}{2n} [c_1 + \cdots + c_n - (n+3)\varepsilon] = \frac{1}{2}c - \frac{n+3}{2n}\varepsilon .$$

Also $|z|_0^n \geq |z|_n^n$ and so the lemma is proved. $\square$

Note that by Proposition 1.2 z satisfies $\|z\| \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|z_i\| \leq K_1$ and $\|z\| \geq \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|z_i\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Furthermore, for an arbitrary $y \in T$, $\|y\| = 1$ implies that $|y|_j^n \geq 2^{-n}$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$ and thus we could have chosen $c_j \geq 2^{-n}$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$ and so in particular $c \geq 2^{-n}$. Thus we can choose ε above to obtain (using Lemma 2.4) that the element z satisfies

$$\frac{1}{3}c \leq |z|_j^n \leq 3c \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq n .$$

These remarks in conjunction with Lemma 2.2 complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. $\square$

Theorem 2.1 can be restated as saying that there exists an absolute constant K such that for all $Y \prec T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $Z \prec Y$ satisfying

$$d = \inf_{0 \leq j < n} \inf_{z \in S_Z} |z|_j^n \leq \sup_{0 \leq j < n} \sup_{z \in S_Z} |z|_j^n \leq Kd . \quad (2.11)$$

It is natural to say that $Z \prec T$ is n -stable at d if Z satisfies (2.11). Obvious questions then arise. How does d depend upon Z , how does it depend upon n ? Our next result answers these questions.

Theorem 2.5 *There exists an absolute constant L so that if $Z \prec Y$ is n -stable at d then $(Kn)^{-1} \leq d \leq Ln^{-1}$.*

Proof. The lower estimate is relatively easy. Let $Z \prec Y$ be n stable at d and let $z \in S_Z$. $\|z\|$ is calculated by a tree ultimately yielding $\|z\| = 1 = \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |z(i)|$ as explained previously. The sets in the tree are permitted to stop at any level. If we gather together those which stop at levels

$j, j+n, j+2n, \dots$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ we obtain $1 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |z|_j^n$. Hence for some $j < n$, $|z|_j^n \geq \frac{1}{n}$, and thus $d \geq \frac{1}{K^n}$, by (2.11).

Let $y \in Z \cap [(e_m)_n]^\infty$ with $\|y\| = 1$ and $y = \sum a_j e_j$. For $0 \leq j < n-1$ choose y_j^* in the unit ball B_{T^*} of T^* so that

$$y_j^*(y) = |y|_j^n = \sum_{s \in A_j} 2^{-(j+k_j(s)n)} |a_s| \geq d.$$

We may assume that $A_j \subseteq \text{supp } y$. Note that $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y_j^*(y) \geq nd$. Partition $\bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} A_i$ into sets $(E_0, \dots, E_{n-1})$ as follows. $s \in E_j$ if and only if for all $i \neq j$ either $s \notin A_i$ or $j + k_j(s)n < i + k_i(s)n$. Then $(E_j y_j^*)_{j=0}^{n-1}$ is a collection of n disjointly supported vectors in B_{T^*} all having support contained in $[(e_m)_n]^\infty$. Since T and the modified Tsirelson space T_M are naturally isomorphic ([CS]) there exists an absolute constant L' so that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} E_j y_j^* \right\| \leq L' \max_{0 \leq j < n} \|E_j y_j^*\|_{T^*} \leq L'.$$

Furthermore

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} E_j y_j^* \right)(y) \geq \frac{nd}{2}.$$

Indeed, for $s \in \bigcup_{j=0}^{n-1} E_j$ pick j_0 such that $s \in E_{j_0}$ and denote by F_s the set of all $0 \leq i < n$, $i \neq j_0$, such that $s \in A_i$. Then $\{i + k_i(s)n : i \in F_s\}$ is a subset of $\{j_0 + k_{j_0}(s)n + 1, j_0 + k_{j_0}(s)n + 2, \dots\}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} nd &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} y_j^*(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{s \in E_j} |a_s| \left(2^{-(j+k_j(s)n)} + \sum_{i \in F_s} 2^{-(i+k_i(s)n)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{s \in E_j} |a_s| \left(2^{-(j+k_j(s)n)} + 2^{-(j+k_j(s)n)} \right) = 2 \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} E_j y_j^*(y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $nd/2 \leq L'$ so $d \leq 2L'/n$. □

As an immediate consequence of Theorems 2.1 and 2.5 we get the following.

Corollary 2.6 *There exists an absolute constant C so that for every $Y \prec T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $Z \prec Y$ and $d > 0$ so that $Z \prec Y$ is n -stable at d and $(Cn)^{-1} \leq d \leq Cn^{-1}$.*

3 Further results

We now turn to some stabilization results for more general norms on T . Given an arbitrary equivalent norm $|\cdot|$ on $Y \prec T$, we describe some procedures on $|\cdot|$, natural in the context of Tsirelson space, which lead to new norms that cannot distort T by too much.

Recall [OTW] that if (y_i) is a basis for Y and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then

$$\delta_n(y_i) = \inf \left\{ \delta \geq 0 : \left\| \sum_1^k x_i \right\| \geq \delta \sum_1^k \|x_i\| \text{ whenever } (x_i)_1^k \text{ is } n\text{-admissible w.r.t. } (y_j) \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

A result of the type we pursue and which we shall need later was proved in [OTW], Theorem 6.2 (in stronger form).

Proposition 3.1 *There exists $D < \infty$ so that if (y_i) is a normalized block basis of (e_i) for $Y \prec T$ and $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on Y with $\delta_1((y_i), |\cdot|) = \frac{1}{2}$ then $|\cdot|$ does not D distort Y .*

Remark 3.2 *It was shown in [OTW] that for a block basis (y_i) of (e_i) and any equivalent norm $|\cdot|$ on $Y = [(y_i)]$,*

$$\delta_n((y_i), |\cdot|) \leq 2^{-n} \text{ for all } n.$$

If $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on $Y = [(y_j)] \prec T$ we set for $j \geq 0$ and $x \in Y$,

$$|x|_j = \frac{1}{2^j} \sup \left\{ \sum_1^\ell |E_i x| : (E_i)_1^\ell \text{ is } j \text{ admissible} \right\},$$

(If $x = \sum a_i y_i$, $E x = \sum_{i \in E} a_i y_i$.) Thus $|z|_0 = |z|$ and $|\cdot|_j$ is an equivalent norm on Y for all j . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we let

$$|z|^{(n)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |z|_j.$$

Proposition 3.3 *There exists $D < \infty$ so that if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on $Y \prec T$ having basis $(y_i) \prec (e_i)$ and satisfying*

$$\left| \sum_1^k x_i \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^k |x_i|_{n-1}$$

for all 1 admissible $(x_i)_1^k \prec (y_j)$ then $|\cdot|^{(n)}$ cannot D distort Y .

Proof. Let $(x_i)_1^k$ be 1 admissible w.r.t. (y_ℓ) . Then for $j \geq 1$,

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \right|_j \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|_{j-1}$$

since $S_1[S_{j-1}] = S_j$. Thus using the hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \right|^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \right|_j + \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|_j + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|_{n-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |x_i|_j \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k |x_i|^{(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\delta_1((y_i), |\cdot|^{(n)}) = \frac{1}{2}$. The proposition follows from Proposition 3.1. $\square$

Remark 3.4 *The hypothesis of Proposition 3.3 is satisfied if $\delta_n(|\cdot|) = 2^{-n}$.*

If $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on $Y = [(y_i)] \prec T$, we define an equivalent norm on Y by

$$|x|_{\text{Tr}} = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |E_i x| : (E_i)_{i \in A} \text{ are the terminal sets of an admissible tree with level } E_i = n(i) \right\}.$$

Clearly $|\cdot| \leq |\cdot|_{\text{Tr}}$ and if $|\cdot| \leq \|\cdot\|$ then $|\cdot|_{\text{Tr}} \leq \|\cdot\|$. Note that $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{\text{Tr}}$ if $(y_i) = (e_i)$.

The constant K_2 appearing in several arguments below is the constant from Proposition 1.3.

Proposition 3.5 *There exists $K (= 2K_2M)$ so that if $|\cdot|$ is any equivalent norm on $Y = [(y_i)] \prec T$ then $|\cdot|_{\text{Tr}}$ does not K distort Y .*

Proof. By multiplying $|\cdot|$ by a scalar and passing to $Z \prec Y$ we may assume $\|\cdot\| \geq |\cdot|$ on Z and Z has a basis $(z_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\|z_i\| = 1$ and $|z_i| > \frac{1}{2}$ for all i . Furthermore by [AO] we may assume that for all j if $(z_i)_{i \in E}$ is j -admissible w.r.t. (e_i) then $(z_{i+1})_{i \in E}$ is j -admissible w.r.t. (y_i) .

Let $z = \sum_1^\ell a_i z_i$ with $\|z\| = 1$. Then $\|\sum_1^\ell a_i z_{i-1}\| \geq M^{-1}$ for some absolute constant M [CS]. By Proposition 1.3 there exists an admissible tree w.r.t. (e_i) having terminal sets of the form $\text{supp } z_{i-1}$ and level $n(i)$ for all i in some set A so that

$$\sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \geq K_2^{-1} \|\sum a_i z_{i-1}\| \geq (K_2 M)^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$|z|_{\text{Tr}} \geq \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| |z_i| > (2K_2 M)^{-1},$$

completing the proof □

Remark 3.6 *It follows from Proposition 3.5 that if $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on $Y = [(y_i)] \prec T$ satisfying $|y|_{\text{Tr}} \leq \gamma |y|$ for all $y \in Y$, then $|\cdot|$ does not $K\gamma$ distort Y .*

Proposition 3.7 *For all $\gamma > 0$ there exists $D(\gamma) < \infty$ with the following property. Let $Y = [(y_i)] \prec T$. If $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on Y and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\delta_n((y_i), |\cdot|) = 2^{-n}$ and $|y|_j \geq \gamma |y|$ for all $y \in Y$ and $j < n$, then $|\cdot|$ does not $D(\gamma)$ distort Y .*

Proof. By Theorem 2.1 we may choose $(z_i) \prec (y_i)$, $Z = [(z_i)]$ so that for some $d > 0$,

$$d \leq \|z\|_n \leq Kd \text{ for all } z \in S_Z.$$

Furthermore by passing to a block basis of Z and scaling $|\cdot|$ as necessary we may assume that $\|z\|_n \geq |z|$ for all $z \in Z$ and $1 = \|z_i\| \geq \|z_i\|_n \geq |z_i| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_i\|_n$ for all i . Finally again by [AO] we may assume that if $(z_i)_{i \in E}$ is j -admissible w.r.t. (e_i) then $(z_{i+1})_{i \in E}$ is j -admissible w.r.t. (y_i) .

Let $z = \sum a_i z_i$ with $\|z\| = 1$.

As in the proof of Proposition 3.5 there exists an admissible tree w.r.t. (y_i) having terminal sets of the form $\text{supp } z_i$ and level $n(i)$, $i \in A$, yielding

$$\sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \|z_i\| \geq (K_2 M)^{-1}.$$

Choose $0 \leq j(i) < n$ so that $n(i) + j(i) \in \{0, n, 2n, \dots\}$. Since $\delta_n((y_i), |\cdot|) = 2^{-n}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |z| &\geq \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| |z_i|_{j(i)} \geq \gamma \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| |z_i| \\ &\geq \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{i \in A} 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \|z_i\|_n \geq \frac{\gamma d}{2K_2 M}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\|z\|_n \geq |z| \geq \frac{\gamma}{2K_2 K M} \|y\|_n.$$

Hence $Kd \geq |z| \geq \frac{\gamma}{2K_2 K M} d$. The theorem is proved with $D(\gamma) = 2\gamma^{-1} K_2 K^2 M$ $\square$

Our next result combines the proofs of Proposition 3.7 and the main theorem.

Proposition 3.8 *For $\gamma > 0$ there exists $D(\gamma) < \infty$ so that the following holds. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $|\cdot|$ be an equivalent norm on $Y = [(y_i)] \prec T$ with $\delta_n(|\cdot|) = 2^{-n}$. Suppose that for all $y \in Y$, $|y|_n \geq \gamma|y|$ and $|y| \geq \gamma|y|_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then $|\cdot|$ does not $D(\gamma)$ distort Y .*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.7 we may assume that $\|\cdot\|_n \geq |\cdot|$ on Z , Z has a normalized (in T) basis $(z_i) \prec (y_i)$ with $|z_i| \geq \frac{1}{2} \|z_i\|_n$ for all i . In addition from Theorem 2.1 we may assume

$$d \leq |z|_j^n \leq Kd \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq n \text{ and } z \in S_Z.$$

Finally we again assume that if $(z_i)_E$ is j -admissible w.r.t. (e_i) then $(z_{i+1})_E$ is j -admissible w.r.t. (y_i) .

Note that the hypothesis $\delta_n(|\cdot|) = 2^{-n}$ implies $|\cdot| \geq |\cdot|_n$ and more generally $|\cdot|_j \geq |\cdot|_{n+j}$. $|\cdot|_n \geq \gamma|\cdot|$ implies that (on Y) $|\cdot|_j \leq \gamma^{-1} |\cdot|_{n+j}$.

Furthermore we may assume that, for a suitably small $\varepsilon > 0$, $||z_\ell|_j - c_j| < \varepsilon$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq j \leq n$ for some $(c_j)_0^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$.

Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$ and let $z = \sum \alpha_\ell z_\ell$ be an (i, ε) average (3) of (z_ℓ) . Note that $|z|_i \geq \frac{1}{2^i} \sum_{\ell \in A} \alpha_\ell |z_\ell| \geq \frac{d}{2}$ hence

$$(i) \quad |z| \geq \gamma|z|_i \geq \frac{d\gamma}{2}.$$

The argument of Lemma 2.3 remains valid for estimates on $|z|_j$. The proof of the upper estimate of (2.6) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |z|_{j+n} &\leq 2c_{n+j-i+1} + 2\varepsilon(K_3 + 1), \text{ hence} \\ |z|_j &\leq \gamma^{-1} (2c_{n+j-i+1} + 2\varepsilon(K_3 + 1)). \end{aligned}$$

If we set $w = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n w_i$ where $(w_i)_1^n \prec (z_\ell)_n^\infty$ and each w_i is an (i, ε) average (3) of (z_i) we obtain as in Lemma 2.4 that (taking ε suitably small)

$$(ii) \quad \frac{1}{3}c \leq |w|_j \leq 3\gamma^{-1}c \quad (0 \leq j \leq n) \text{ where } c = \frac{1}{n} \sum_1^n c_i.$$

Also

$$|w|_1 \geq \frac{1}{2n} \sum_1^n |w_i| \geq \frac{d\gamma}{4}$$

from (i) and so

$$(iii) \quad |w| \geq \gamma|w|_1 \geq \frac{d}{4}\gamma^2.$$

From ii) and iii) we have $\frac{d}{4}\gamma^2 \leq 3\gamma^{-1}c$ and so $c \geq \frac{d\gamma^3}{12}$. Thus from ii)

(iv) $|w|_j \geq \frac{d\gamma^3}{36}$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$.

We are ready to apply the proof of Proposition 3.7. Let $(w_i) \prec (z_\ell)$ be such that each w_i is constructed as was w above. Let $w = \sum a_i w_i$ with $\|w\| = 1$. Choose an admissible tree having terminal sets $\text{supp } w_i$ for $i \in A$ yielding $\sum 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| \|w_i\| \geq (K_2 M)^{-1}$. It follows that if $0 \leq j(i) < n$ satisfies $n(i) + j(i) \in \{0, n, 2n, \dots\}$ then

$$Kd \geq \|w\|_n \geq |w| \geq \sum 2^{-n(i)} |a_i| |w_i|_{j(i)} \geq \frac{d\gamma^3}{36K_2M}.$$

The theorem is proved with $D(\gamma) = \frac{36KK_2M}{\gamma^3}$. $\square$

In comparison with (1.3), it is of interest to consider the mixed Tsirelson space (see [AD]) $T((S_k, c_k 2^{-k})_k)$, where $c_k \uparrow 1$. We then ask whether it also coincides with T , or at least, whether its norm, $|\cdot|$ say, is an equivalent norm on a subspace of T . The following result gives the positive answer to the latter question. It also indicates that the answer to the former question probably depends upon the asymptotic behavior of (c_k) . Finally, it should be compared with Example 5.12 from [OTW] which implies that if $c_k < \delta < 1$ then no subspace of $T((S_k, c_k 2^{-k})_k)$ is isomorphic to a subspace of T .

Proposition 3.9 *There exists a block subspace $X \prec T$ such that $c\|x\| \leq |x| \leq \|x\|$ for $x \in X$, where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, independent of the choice of $c_k \uparrow 1$.*

Outline of the proof. Clearly, $|x| \leq \|x\|$ for all $x \in T$. Choose $n(i) \uparrow \infty$ such that $\prod_1^\infty c_{n(i)} > \frac{1}{2}$ and $\sum_1^\infty 2^{-n(i)} < 1/4K_2$. Let $m(1) = n(1)$ and inductively choose $m(i) \uparrow \infty$ so that $m(i+1) \geq 2(m(i) + n(i))$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$

Choose $(x_i) \prec T$ to be a block basis of (e_i) such that each x_i is an $(m(i), 1)$ average (1) of (e_i) . In particular, $x_i = \sum_{j \in F_i} \alpha_j^i e_j$, where $\alpha_j^i > 0$ for $j \in F_i$, $F_i \in S_{m(i)}$ and $\sum_{j \in F_i} \alpha_j^i = 2^{m(i)}$. It is easy to check that $1 \leq \|x_i\| \leq 2$.

Let $x = \sum_1^\ell a_i x_i$ with $\|x\| = 1$. By Proposition 1.3 there exists an admissible tree $\mathcal{T}$ having terminal sets of the form $\text{supp } x_i$ and level $p(i)$, yielding

$$\sum_{i \in S} 2^{-p(i)} |a_i| \|x_i\| \geq 1/K_2,$$

for some $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. Set $G = \{i \in S : p(i) \leq n(i)\}$. Note that if $B = S \setminus G$ then $\sum_B 2^{-p(i)} \leq \sum_B 2^{-n(i)} < 1/4K_2$, and so

$$\sum_{i \in B} 2^{-p(i)} |a_i| \|x_i\| < 2/4K_2 = 1/2K_2.$$

Thus

$$\sum_{i \in G} 2^{-p(i)} |a_i| \|x_i\| > 1/2K_2.$$

Prune the tree $\mathcal{T}$ so as to only admit terminal sets of the form $\text{supp } x_i$ for $i \in G$. Extend each of these sets $m(i)$ levels in an admissible fashion, ending at the singletons which form $\text{supp } x_i$, ultimately obtaining an admissible tree $\mathcal{T}'$. Since $\|x_i\| \leq 2$, it follows that

$$\sum_{i \in G} 2^{-p(i)} |a_i| \sum_{j \in F_i} 2^{-m(i)} \alpha_j^i > 1/4K_2,$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i \in G} \sum_{j \in F_i} 2^{-p(i)-m(i)} |a_i| \alpha_j^i > 1/4K_2 .$$

For $i \in G$ all elements in the support of x_i are terminal sets of $\mathcal{T}'$ having level $j(i) \equiv p(i) + m(i)$. Note that for $i' \in G$, $i' > i$, the definition of G and the growth condition on $m(i)$ imply that

$$j(i') - j(i) = p(i') + m(i') - p(i) - m(i) \geq m(i') - n(i) - m(i) \geq n(i) .$$

Let $G = \{i_1, \dots, i_s\}$ written in the increasing order. The admissible tree $\mathcal{T}'$ has terminal sets of level $j(i_1)$ which together equal the support of x_{i_1} , of level $j(i_2)$ which together equal the support of x_{i_2} , and so on. Also, $j(i_{k+1}) - j(i_k) \geq n(i_k) \geq n(k)$.

By considering all the sets of $\mathcal{T}'$ of level $j(i_1)$ we obtain

$$|x| \geq c_{j(i_1)} \left(2^{j(i_1)} |a_{i_1}| \sum_{j \in F_{i_1}} \alpha_j^{i_1} + 2^{j(i_1)} \sum_{r=1}^{r(1)} |E_r^{i_1} x| \right) ,$$

where $(E_r^{i_1})$ are the remaining sets in $\mathcal{T}'$ of level $j(i_1)$ which are disjoint from the support of x_{i_1} .

We iterate this estimate next continuing the sets $(E_r^{i_1})$ to level $j(i_2)$ and so on. Ultimately we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |x| \geq & c_{j(i_1)} \left(2^{j(i_1)} |a_{i_1}| \sum_{j \in F_{i_1}} \alpha_j^{i_1} + c_{j(i_2)-j(i_1)} \left(2^{j(i_2)} |a_{i_2}| \sum_{j \in F_{i_2}} \alpha_j^{i_2} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + c_{j(i_3)-j(i_2)} \left(2^{j(i_3)} |a_{i_3}| \sum_{j \in F_{i_3}} \alpha_j^{i_3} + \dots \right) \right) \right) . \end{aligned}$$

Since $j(i_{k+1}) - j(i_k) \geq n(k)$, this yields that

$$|x| \geq \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} c_{n(k)} \left(\sum_{r=1}^s 2^{-j(i_r)} |a_{i_r}| \sum_{j \in F_{i_r}} \alpha_j^{i_r} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} (1/4K_2) = 1/8K_2 ,$$

completing the proof. $\square$

Until now we considered the Tsirelson space $T \equiv T(S_1, 2^{-1})$, its subspaces and renormings. Analogous results also hold for Tsirelson spaces $T_\theta \equiv T(S_1, \theta)$, where $0 < \theta < 1$. It should be noted however, that absolute constants will change to functions depending on θ (typically of the form $c\theta^{-1}$ where c is an absolute constant).

In particular, let us recall that the space T_θ admits a $\theta^{-1} - \varepsilon$ distorted norm for every $\varepsilon > 0$ (the proof is exactly the same as for T). In this context a distortion property of the renorming $T(S_n, \theta^n)$ of T_θ might be also of interest.

Proposition 3.10 *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \theta < 1$. Let $X = T(S_n, \theta^n)$. Every $Y \prec X$ contains $Z \prec Y$ such that Z is $\theta^{-1} - \varepsilon$ distortable for every $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Outline of the proof. First note that the modulus δ_m defined in (3.1) satisfies: For all $Y \prec X$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta_{nk}(Y) \leq \theta^{n(k-1)+1}$. Indeed, let $Y \prec X$ and let (y_i) be a normalized basis in Y . Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and $y = \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i y_i$ be an (nk, ε) average (1), satisfying conditions i) and ii) of Proposition 1.2. (Observe that these two conditions have a purely combinatorial character, and

their validity does not depend on the underlying Banach space.) In particular, $\sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i = 2^{nk}$. Then $\|y\| \geq \delta_{nk}(Y)2^{nk}$. Iterating the definition of the norm $k - 1$ times we obtain

$$\|y\| \leq \theta^{n(k-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \|E_j y\| + \sum_{i \in B} \alpha_i ,$$

where $i \in B$ if $\text{supp } y_i$ is split by some set in the tree of sets obtained by iterating the norm definition. Thus $B \in S_{n(k-1)}$ and $E_1 < \dots < E_{\ell}$ is $n(k-1)$ -admissible, and for $s \leq \ell$ and $i \in A$ one has $E_s \cap \text{supp } y_i = \emptyset$ or $E_s \supseteq \text{supp } y_i$. Thus

$$\|y\| \leq \theta^{n(k-1)} \sum_{i \in A} \alpha_i + \varepsilon \leq \theta^{n(k-1)} 2^{nk} + \varepsilon .$$

Comparing this with the lower estimate for $\|y\|$ yields the required bound for $\delta_{nk}(Y)$.

The supermultiplicativity property $\delta_{nk}(Y) \geq (\delta_1(Y))^{nk}$ ([OTW], Prop. 4.11) and the previous estimate immediately imply that for all $Y \prec X$, $\delta_1(Y) \leq \theta$.

This in turn implies that for every $Y \prec X$ there exists $Z \prec Y$ such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the following: for all $W \prec Z$ there exist $w_1 < \dots < w_k$ in W such that $\|\sum_{i=1}^k w_i\| = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \|w_i\| \geq \theta^{-1} - \varepsilon$. If not then stabilizing suitable quantities for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ by passing to appropriate subspaces, then using a diagonal argument and the definition of S_1 , we would get a subspace Y' with $\delta_1(Y') > \theta$.

Now, given $\varepsilon > 0$, define $|\cdot|$ on Z by

$$|z| = \sup_{E_1 < \dots < E_k} \sum_{i=1}^k \|E_i z\| ,$$

where Ez is the projection with respect to the basis of Z . Clearly, $\|z\| \leq |z| \leq k\|z\|$ for $z \in Z$. Let $W \prec Z$. By the previous claim, there exists $w \in W$ with $\|w\| = 1$ and $|w| \geq \theta^{-1} - \varepsilon$. On the other hand, a standard argument involving long ℓ_1^m averages implies that there exists $x \in W$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and $|x| \leq 1 + \varepsilon$ (see e.g., [OTW], Prop. 2.7). $\square$

4 Problems

Of course the main problem is

Problem 4.1 *Is T arbitrarily distortable? Is any subspace of T arbitrarily distortable?*

Our work in Section 3 suggests the following problems.

Problem 4.2 *Prove that the class of equivalent norms on T for which $\delta_n(|\cdot|) = 2^{-n}$ for some $n > 1$ do not arbitrarily distort T or any $Y \prec T$.*

Problem 4.3 *Prove that for $\gamma > 0$ there exists $K(\gamma) < \infty$ so that if $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on T satisfying $\delta_n(|\cdot|) \geq \gamma 2^{-n}$ for all n then $|\cdot|$ does not $K(\gamma)$ distort any $Y \prec T$.*

Problem 4.4 *Prove there exists $K < \infty$ so that if $|\cdot|$ is an equivalent norm on T and $Y \prec T$ then for some n , $|\cdot|^{(n)}$ does not K distort Y .*

References

- [AA] D. Alspach and S. Argyros: *Complexity of weakly null sequences*, Diss. Math., **321** (1992).
- [AO] G. Androulakis and E. Odell: *Distorting mixed Tsirelson spaces*, Israel J. of Math., to appear.
- [AD] S. Argyros and I. Deliyanni: *Examples of asymptotically ℓ^1 Banach spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **349** (1997), no. 3, 973–995.
- [CS] P. G. Casazza and T. J. Shura: *Tsirelson's Space*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1363, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1989.
- [LT] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri: *Classical Banach spaces*, vol I, Springer Verlag 1977.
- [M] B. Maurey: *A remark about distortion*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications, **77** (1995), 131–142.
- [MT] V. Milman and N. Tomczak-Jaegermann: *Asymptotic ℓ_p spaces and bounded distortion*, (Bor-Luh Lin and W.B. Johnson, eds.), Contemporary Math., **144** Amer. Math. Soc., (1993), 173–195.
- [OTW] E. Odell, N. Tomczak-Jaegermann and R. Wagner: *Proximity to ℓ_1 and Distortion in Asymptotic ℓ_1 Spaces*, Jour. of Funct. Anal., **150** (1997), 101–145.
- [T] N. Tomczak-Jaegermann: *Banach spaces of type $p > 1$ have arbitrarily distortable subspaces*, Geom. and Funct. Analysis, **6** (1996), 1074–1082.

Edward Odell: Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin,
Austin, TX 78712, USA
e-mail: odell@math.utexas.edu

Nicole Tomczak-Jaegermann: Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G1, Canada
e-mail: ntomczak@math.ualberta.ca